UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA \* Case No. 21-MJ-0057(CLP)

\*

\* Brooklyn, New York\* January 19, 2021

\*

BRENDAN HUNT,

\*

Defendant.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR ARRAIGNMENT BEFORE THE HONORABLE RAMON E. REYES, JR. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

v.

For the Government: DAVID R. KESSLER, ESQ.

IAN RICHARDSON, ESQ. FRANCISCO OLIVERA, ESQ.

Asst. United States Attorney
United States Attorney's Office

271 Cadman Plaza Brooklyn, NY 11201

For the Defendant: LETICIA OLIVERA, ESQ.

Federal Defenders of New York,

Inc.

One Pierrepont Plaza Brooklyn, NY 11201

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc. 4 Research Drive, Suite 402 Shelton, Connecticut 06484 (203)929-9992

2 1 (Proceedings commenced.) 2 THE CLERK: Criminal cause for arraignment, 21-MJ-3 57, United States vs. Brendan Hunt. Counsel state your appearances, please, starting with the government. 4 MR. KESSLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. David 5 Kessler, Ian Richardson and Francisco Navarro for the 6 7 government. 8 THE COURT: Good morning. Good afternoon. Excuse 9 me. MS. OLIVERA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Leticia 10 Olivera, Federal Defenders of New York, on behalf of Mr. 11 12 Hunt. THE COURT: Good afternoon. 13 Mr. Hunt, you're here today because charges have 14 15 been filed against you in a criminal case. 16 The purpose of this proceeding is to make sure you are aware of those charges and to make sure that you 17 understand your rights as a defendant in a criminal case and 18 19 to address the question of whether you should be held in jail 20 or released on bail pending your trial. 21 You have the right to remain silent. You do not 22 have to make a statement to anyone. If you start to make a 23 statement, you can stop at any time. If you've made 24 statements in the past, you are not required to make

statements in the future.

25

with intent to impede, intimidate and interfere with such

25

```
1
        official while engaged the performance of official duties and
 2
        with intent to retaliate against such official on account of
 3
        the performance of the official duties in violation of Title
 4
        18 United States Code Section 115(a).
                  Have you received a copy of the complaint?
 5
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 6
 7
                  THE COURT: You discussed the charges with your
 8
        attorney?
 9
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
                  THE COURT: Do you understand the charges?
10
                  THE DEFENDANT: I'm aware of the charges.
11
                  THE COURT: Not whether you agree with them but
12
        did you just understand what the charges are?
13
                  THE DEFENDANT: I understood that I'm being charged
14
15
        for this, yeah.
16
                  THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Olivera, you've discussed
        this with Mr. Hunt?
17
18
                  MS. OLIVERA: I have, Your Honor.
19
                  THE COURT: Are you satisfied that he understands
20
        the charges and his rights?
2.1
                  MS. OLIVERA: I am.
22
                  THE COURT: Does Mr. Hunt want a preliminary
23
        hearing?
24
                  MS. OLIVERA: Your Honor, I've discussed with Mr.
25
        Hunt his right to a preliminary hearing and he will be
```

waiving that right today.

1.3

2.1

THE COURT: Okay. What is the government's position with respect to bail?

MR. KESSLER: Your Honor, this is David Kessler.

The government agrees with Pretrial Services that detention is appropriate in this case for the following reasons.

This is an extremely serious crime. The allegations involve a chilling and (indiscernible) series of calls for direct violence against members of Congress over a month. These include calls for firing squads and for people to bring their guns to the inauguration tomorrow on January 20th.

This series culminated in a January 8th video threatening the slaughter of U.S. senators and members of Congress and the overthrow of the elected government by so-called actual patriots, and the solicitation by the defendant for a firearm so he could participate directly in the slaughter.

These threats would be grave under any circumstances, but they're even more so in the volatile environment we find ourselves in today leading up to the inauguration. Of course, the defendant faces a maximum sentence of ten years in prison.

The weight of the evidence is overwhelming. The

January 8th threat is on video showing the defendant, his prior statements and call for violence are written. The context of these threats is well known. You know, the history and characteristics of the defendant also weigh against release.

I won't go too much into the Pretrial Services report but there are items in here that raised even additional concerns, including a statement by the defendant's father, who I believe (indiscernible) surety.

And finally the risk of flight is (indiscernible) given the length of prison the defendant faces and his limited ties to the community. He seems to be alienated from most of his family, and the danger to the community, which is acute (indiscernible) particularly in this current environment.

So for all those reasons, as I said, the government agrees with Pretrial Services (indiscernible) detention is appropriate in this case.

THE COURT: Ms. Olivera.

MS. OLIVERA: Your Honor, there is no presumption of detention based on the charges in the complaint.

That means that the government must provide clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Hunt's danger -- that Mr. Hunt's release would present a danger to the community and there are no conditions that can reasonably guarantee the

safety of the community.

The government relies exclusively on the nature and circumstances of the offense, which is insufficient as a matter of law because this is not an offense that carries a presumption of detention.

And even if you accept the government's argument that the nature and circumstances of the offense weigh in favor of detention, this factor cannot overcome the rest of the 3142(q) factors that weigh in favor of release.

Mr. Hunt has no criminal history or history of arrest whatsoever. While there may be some indications of past family issues, he's never been arrested in connection with these issues and no orders of protection have been issued against him to stay away from any members of his family.

I strongly dispute that he has no ties to the community. This is someone that was born and raised in Queens. He's lived there his entire life. At the time of his arrest he was a long-term employee of the New York Court System. He has a stable residence and he has a strong relationship with his father who is willing to sign a bond to secure his release if necessary.

But going back to the nature and circumstances of the offense without seeking to undermine the seriousness of the allegations of the complaint there is no allegation here

Mr. Hunt has a history of use or ownership of weapons. He has no membership in a militia or a paramilitary group. He had no plan to travel to Washington, D.C. to purchase weapons or to actually even come in contact with any federal officials, much less do anything to cause them physical harm.

The allegations in the complaint do not suggest anything other than a plan to make outlandish posts online from inside his home.

Unfortunately, in this environment we know what it looks like when members of the community present an actual threat to federal officials.

There is no indication that Mr. Hunt has participated in any of the recent events designed to threaten members of Congress or other federal officials or overthrow the government. We unfortunately know what that looks like and it's not this.

The government's position in favor of detention I should also note is contrary to their agreement to release somebody who was actually arrested based on their participation in the raid on the capital.

In 21-MJ-0027 the government consented to the release of an individual who traveled to D.C. and entered the capital with a mob that was armed and threatened to harm people inside the capital.

So if that person can be released on bond, there's

no reason why Mr. Hunt, who is only alleged to have taken action inside of his home on his computer, cannot be released on bond.

THE COURT: Mr. Kessler.

MR. KESSLER: One moment, Your Honor.

So a couple of responses. The first is just because 18 USC 115 doesn't carry a presumption of detention doesn't mean that in this particular case detention is not appropriate. I mean, the government is relying on the defendant's own videotaped podcast words calling for the slaughter of members of Congress and volunteering to participate.

The fact that there's no (indiscernible) that he's a member of a militia and that he's a lone wolf instead is neither here nor there for the threats.

You know, secondly, the government is not relying solely on the nature and circumstances of the offense, although they'll be sufficient in this case, the limited ties to the community are clear.

The only person who has stepped forward as a surety in this matter is the defendant's father, not even the rest of his family. There's no one else being offered as a surety. There's no one else in the picture.

In addition, there are concerns about the defendant's mental health which are set forth in the Pretrial Services report.

And finally, although I'm not -- I don't have the case in front of me, the defense counsel raised, you know, going to the capital on January 6th is not the same thing as broadcasting a call to murder members of Congress and repeatedly encouraging the members -- the murder of members of Congress. That's not a case that's comparable here.

So on these facts, on these circumstances, given the defendant's own videotaped and written words and the other factors I've reviewed, detention is appropriate.

Although this is not a presumption case detention is appropriate.

In light of the nature and circumstances of the offense charged, which is very serious, the weight of the evidence against Mr. Hunt, which is strong, his history and characteristics, suspicion of mental health issues, family ties that are, according to the Pretrial Services Report, tenuous at best, some history of drug use and the nature and seriousness of the danger to the community, in particular the legislative community and elected officials, and direct calls for others to cause them physical harm, I find that detention is appropriate.

There are no conditions or combinations of